In the United States District Court,

Northern District Of Illinois

Reza Foroohar,	)	case # 97 C 2391
Plaintiff,	)	Judge HON. Robert W.
V.	)	Gettleman
Supreme court of Illinois	)	
et Al Respondents.	)	

ORDER

The court has reviewed the PRO SE complaint herein SUA SPONTE.the complaint in eight pages of unnumbered paragraph,along with a seventh pages brief,alleges numerous grievance by plaintiff apparently arising from his divorce,these claim concern the Illinois Judiciary Board (:JIB:) Handling of complaints against illinois judges,The Illinois Attorney Registration and Disciplinary Commission,s (:A.R.D.C:) handling of complaints.various instance of alleged judicial and attorney misconduct and misuse of public funds,and (apparently) irregularities with respect to the award of plaintiff,s children .Plaintiff seeks damages in excess of one hundred million dollars,:The gravamen of the complaint appears to be a mixture of attorney malpractice and judicial misbehavior.THe complaint fails to state a bases for Federal jurisdiction and none is apparent to this court

Moreover,to the extent plaintiff seeks monetary relief from various Illinois judges (and court personal and agencies) for exercising discretionary duties,plaintiff has failed to allege any facts that could possibly over come the doctrine of judicial immunity,see Cruggs V. Moellering, 870 F.2d 376.377 (7th CIR.1989):Forrester V.White,484 U.S 219.229 (1988).Accordingly,On the Court,s Motion the Complaint is dismissed April 9 1997.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

NORTHERN DISTRUCT OF ILLINOIS

Reza Foroohar,	) Case# 97 C 2391
Plaintiff	) judge HON. Robert W.
V.	) Gettlemen.
Supreme Court of Illinois	)
et al Respondents,	)

ORDER

This matter is before court on plaintiff,s PRO SE motion to reconsider the order entered April 9 1997 dismissing on the court,s motion the PRO SE complaint for lack of Federal jurisdiction,among other reason.the motion for reconsider reinforce the court conclusion that no Federal jurisdiction exits.indeed,the documents attached to the motion,as well as the arguments made in

the motion itself,demonstrate that the matters about which plaintiff complains were and should have been raised in the state court either at the trial or appellate level.In addition,it appears that to extent plaintiff claims that the conduct of the state judge and the lawyer for the plaintiff,s former wife in the divorce proceeding violate 42U.S.C §1983,they would be barred by the two years statute of limitation, Accordingly.for the reason set forth in the April 9 97 order,as well as the reason stated above,plaintiff,s motion for reconsider is denied.4/25/1997.

On 5/21/97 court denied motion for reconsideration order 4/25/1997.

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE SEVENTH CIRCUIT

Judgement without oral argument. Date OCT.16 1997

Before: HON. John L.Coffey,HON. Frank H.Easterbrook, HON.Michael S.Lanne,circuit Judges

NO.97-2323

Reza Foroohar, Plaintiff-appellant

V.

Supreme Court of Illinois et al,Defendant-Appellees,

Appeal from The United States District,for the Northern District of Illinois Eastern Division NO. 97 C 2391 Robert W. Gettleman,Judge.

The judgement of the District Court is affirmed,with costs in accordance of this court entered on this date.

United states court of Appeals for the seventh Circuit,Chicago Illinois,60604 Date NOV.14/1997

Before: HON. John L.coffey,HON.Frank H.Easterbrook, Hon Michael S.Kanne,Circuit Judges.

Reza Foroohar, Plaintiff-Appellant

V.

Supreme court Of Illinois,et al, Defendant-appellees, Appeal from United States District court for Northern District of Illinois,Eastern Division NO. 97 C 2391 Robert W. Gettlemen Judge.

ORDER

On consideration of the petition for rehearing filed in the above entitled cause,all of the judges on the original panel,have voted to deny a rehearing, Accordingly,it is ordered that the aforesaid petition, for rehearing be and the same is hereby denied.

STATUTORY PROVISIONS,

A) 42 U.S.C.§ 1983

Every person who,under color of any statue,ordinance ,regulation,custom or usage,of any state or territory or the District of Columbia,subjects or causes to be subjected,any citizen of the United States or other person within the jurisdiction there of to the deprivation of any rights,privileges or immunities secured by the constitution and law,shall be liable to the party injured in an action at law,suit in equity,or other proper proceeding for redress, for the purposes of this section,any act of congress applicable exclusively to the District of Columbia shall be considered to be a statute of the District of Columbia.